US Army Corps of Engineers ®
Portland District

TAG Meeting Minutes

Date: 16 April 2020, 9:00 to 10:00 am, Teleconference

Project: Bradford Island

Subject: Technical Advisory Group Meeting Minutes

Prepared By: USACE

AGENCY	ATTENDEES
USACE	Chris Budai, Dan Carlson, Kristen Kerns, Bill Gardiner, Katie Richwine, Ken Duncan
Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality (DEQ)	Bob Schwarz, Mike Poulsen, Jennifer Peterson
Yakama Nation Fisheries (YNF)	Laura Shira
WA Department of Ecology	(not represented)
Bonneville Power Admin. (BPA)	(not represented)
US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Jeremy Buck
Nez Perce	(not represented)
Oregon Health Authority	(not represented)
USEPA	Sean Sheldrake

1) Stations proposed for full congener analysis

- Kristen – USACE objectives for the 10 full congener suite is to make sure we're not missing any individual congener that could be coming from a unique source. USACE had selected former debris piles where PCB transformer oil was, the bulb slope since that is a unique source, and the outfalls since that is a mix of different sources. The intent is to look for a unique signature and see if there are additional congeners we might want to look into in addition to those on the subset list.
- ODEQ and USFWS sent additional questions yesterday on the sample locations on the maps.
    - Kristen – The bulb slope position on the new figure is a modified position that was confirmed with more recent surveys for slope stability. The optimal position for full congener analysis in this area will move slightly from the initial location proposed.
    - Kristen – We're dealing with some old data and figures from historic GIS data and we are in the process of reconfirming locations. We haven't done design-level surveys. The locations are based on the RI data.
    - Jennifer – We were looking at a TAG meeting presentation from June 2018 that had maps that had desired locations relative to contours. Those maps would be useful to put on these maps.
        - Kristen – Some of that is hard, particularly with the contours. The team now doesn't have the background on those 2011 surveys. We're switching over to the 2019 survey done by the Redlinger crew, and we've having GIS convert that

to a compatible format. The newer products we're providing we are assuming have a higher level of accuracy and precision in comparison to the old GIS data from old figures. We can continue to answer questions on discrepancies between old and new maps.

  - Kristen – There were a number of sample locations that had discrepancies identified. I haven't gone through each location in detail. One of the maps that has the "B" and "R" numbers is the one we'd been using in the field, and it hasn't be rectified with the field notes yet which is why there are discrepancies between the different sample location maps.
    - Katie – I haven't looked at the discrepancies identified in the ODEQ email yet in detail but will be.
- Bob – Of the 10 proposed, 3 are the same as the alternative locations proposed. Hopefully we will get to alignment on all 10 locations.
  - Kristen – Would like to go through the justifications for each location today to get on the same page there. The exact locations proposed could change more as we update the maps. Would like to hear the rationale for having samplers in Removal Areas 2 and 3.
    - Jennifer – We tried to place full congener analysis locations across the different former sources. We also used maps that showed high levels of contamination in sediment and clams. We wanted to additionally target offshore locations that have showed contamination; a map in the June 2018 TAG meeting showed these Removal Area 2 and 3 locations. If we can get these areas, it would increase TAG's confidence in the results. Removal Area 3 was an offshore area just downstream of the bulb slope with high concentrations; we wanted a sample in that area and wanted to confirm that sample B49 was in fact in that area.
      - Kristen –We will confirm the removal areas and overlay them on updated maps.
- Jeremy – There is a risk by putting locations offshore that you might lose information that you could potentially get near shore. Did we determine if we could composite some samples offshore to cover a larger area?
  - Kristen – At this point we'd agreed to not do any compositing.
    - Jeremy – All samples have an individual signature. I don't want to compromise the main analysis.
- Kristen – Some of the offshore locations, such as 7, 9, and 10, what is the thinking of doing the offshore locations? The near shore is supposed to theoretically be the hottest areas that could give a good signature of the full congener suite. There could be some transport of contamination further offshore. Do you think there could be a different signature offshore?
  - Jennifer – I think there could be a different signature, from equipment rolling offshore. We don't really know. East of debris pile #2 is a source area there. If we cover all near shore and offshore, I'd feel more confident in the signature. Heidi also wanted some offshore locations.
  - Bob – It was largely related to sediments and clams.
  - Mike – Just in case there are different signatures.
  - Bill – The purpose of this is to make sure we all feel confident in the data set and make sure there isn't any other source we might be missing. The alternative approach generally lines up with what we've been thinking as well. The outfalls to me represent one of the areas that is less understood than what is in the river. I see the greatest potential for additional congeners we haven't seen before to be in the outfall area. I'd

like to see locations by the outfalls. We're also dealing with samplers that might be showing more signal in some locations than others and we can't tell that yet.

- Laura – When do you anticipate the data coming in?
    - Bill –The lab at TTU is closed right now because of coronavirus. The samples have been extracted so they are stable, but we are waiting for the lab to reopen and we don't have a timeline for that yet; we're hoping it could be a month from now.
- Bob – Can we wait to decide which samples to choose for full congener analysis until we get the data for the subset of congeners for other samples?
    - Bill – We might want to wait before analyzing all samplers. A tiered analysis might be a good approach. The alternative locations laid out makes sense to me.
    - Kristen – The quantification step is one thing, there are standards the lab also has to run. But they might not have to run all the standards if they are just doing a subset. I think we have some flexibility. We would have to confirm with Texas Tech how much flexibility we have.
- Bill – It sounds like let's shoot for a list of ten, but if we find during analysis that there is an additional location we want to do we can figure out how to address that.
    - Bob – That sounds good.
- Jennifer – Do we have information on the temperature sensors that determined the locations chosen?
    - Kristen – The temperature data didn't influence the locations chosen. The data was just downloaded and analysis still needs to be performed. The locations chosen were just those based on previous sources where we thought unique signatures would be most likely.
- Bill – We weren't thinking through the removal action areas. I think that's an interesting approach that makes sense. We have some more map work to do for confirming certain locations are correct. We can look through the list versus the updated maps and get back to the TAG as to if we'd propose changing any of the alternative locations the TAG proposed.
- Jennifer – Do you think you need more samples by the outfalls?
    - Bill – I think we have a good spread with sample locations 1 and 14. One of the things about this area is it can be fairly dynamic depending on whether the spillway is open or closed, water can come off the dam face and come back up along the shoreline. It's hard to get a sense of where sediment from the outfall is actually settling.
- Bob – Are there any other features that aren't shown yet, in additional to RA2 and RA3, that we'd like on the maps?
    - Jennifer – It looks like you circled where the samples in the debris pile would be, but it would be good to show the actual footprints of the debris piles.
    - Katie – I can look into adding additional features.
    - Bob – Simple outlines of the debris piles would be good, the simpler the better.
    - Bill – As we create maps, we're trying to create them that will serve us throughout the project for other purposes. The higher resolution maps you've seen are from the hydrosurvey groups in Portland; Katie is working with them to try and bring that data into the ArcGIS maps. Gradually we should be able to refine this.
- Dan – For action items moving forward, we will work on getting revised versions of the map back to the TAG and communicate any proposed changes to the alternative locations the TAG proposed for full congener analysis.
- Sean – We're scheduled to have a higher level managers meeting soon.

- Chris – We hope to have the stormwater data validated by the end of April. Our next TAG meeting can be to discuss that data and get concurrence on the alternative locations proposed. Kristen – Let's put 2 hours on the calendar just in case we need the time for the stormwater discussion. Chris – I'll send a meeting invite for 10am to 12pm on May 21st.